UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,565	02/07/2001	Murthi Nanja	INTL-0521-US (P10765)	4410

21906 7590 06/23/2006

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER	
WOO, ISAAC M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/778,565
Filing Date: February 07, 2001
Appellant(s): NANJA, MURTHI

Timothy N. Trop
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed March 31, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed January 30, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

1. The rejection of claims 1-8, 12-19 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over the Khan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,575, hereinafter, "Khan") in view of the Ohashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,699).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,438,575	Khan et al	08-2002
6,172,699	Ohashi	04-2002

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-8, 12-19 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over the Khan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,575, hereinafter, "Khan") in view of the Ohashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,699). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on January 30, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 12-19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,575, hereinafter, "Khan") in view of Ohashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,699).

With respect to claims 1, 8, 12, 19 and 23, Khan discloses the method, medium storing instructions processor-based system, and system, aggregating information (web content) from two or more web site (col. 10, lines 44-50) on a client (i.e., network server, 308 in fig. 3, 206 in fig. 2, col. 10, lines 44-57), see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 9, lines 55-67 to col. 10, lines 1-26, col.11, lines 36-64, col. 1, lines 43-67 to col. 2, lines 1-34); detecting the occurrence of a predetermined time, see (col. 11, lines 13-22, col. 2, lines 39-48); and automatically transferring information (210, i.e., transmitting content to a wireless device in fig. 2) to a wireless device (i.e., 302, wireless device in fig. 3) at the predetermined time (col. 11, lines 12-23), see (fig. 2, col. 11, lines 13-22, col. 2, lines 39-48, fig.3) from the two or more web sites (col. 10, lines 44-50). Khan does not explicitly disclose, single connection session. However, Ohashi discloses, "plurality of pages of image data is sent in one communication connection session (such a function

may be called multi-receiving)", see (col.7, lines 55-66, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 3, lines 60-67 to col. 4, lines 1-15). This teaches that single connection session provides data transmission (transferring) in network environment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Khan by incorporating single connection session as discussed by Ohashi. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use such a combination because that would provide Khan's system the enhanced auto-data and multiple data transmitting with single communication connection session (without re-connection session) in network communication environment, especially internet communication. Thus, a user can receive information in regular base without the retrying connection session.

With respect to claims 2, 13 and 24, Khan discloses the aggregating the information from two or more web sites on a processor-based system connectable to the wireless device, see (col. 9, lies 55-67 to col. 10, lines 1-26, col. 1, lines 17-67 to col. 2, lines 1-62, FIG. 3, col. 11, lines 37-67 to col. 12, lines 1-51).

With respect to claims 3 and 14, Khan discloses the receiving user requests for information from web sites and storing the information received from web sites, see (FIG.3, col. 11, lines 37-67 to col. 12, lines 1-51).

With respect to claims 4 and 15, Khan discloses the establishing a telephone connection and during that connection, accessing the requested information from at least one web site, see (col. 2, lines 11-34, col. 9, lies 55-67 to col. 10, lines 1-26).

With respect to claims 5 and 16, Khan discloses the accessing information from at least two web sites using a single connection, see (FIG. 4, col. 17, lines 17-67 to col. 18, lines 1-59).

With respect to claims 6 and 17, Khan discloses the aggregating the information in response to the detection of an event, see (col. 7, lines 8-37, col. 9, lines 55-67 to col. 10, lines 1-26).

With respect to claims 7 and 18, Khan discloses the detecting a period of low activity on a processor-based system, see (fig.1, col. 3, lines 44-65, col. 13, lines 13-62, the computer operating system checks cpu usages or memory usages).

With respect to claim 25, Khan discloses the Internet connection, see (135, fig.1, col. 8, lines 32-54).

(11) Response to Argument

For claims 1, 12 and 23, applicant argued that the references do not teach:

1) *transferring data at a predetermined time from two or more web sites in a single connection time.*

2) *aggregating the websites on a client.*

The argument is not persuasive.

Regarding point 1), Khan teaches transferring information (210, i.e., transmitting content to a wireless device in fig. 2) to a wireless device (i.e., 302, wireless device in fig. 3) at the predetermined time (col. 11, lines 12-23), see (fig. 2, col. 11, lines 13-22, col. 2, lines 39-48, fig. 3) from the two or more web sites (col. 10, lines 44-50). Ohashi teaches data is sent in one connection session (col. 7, lines 55-59). Hence, the references teach *transferring data at a predetermined time from two or more web sites in a single connection time* as claimed.

Regarding point 2), Khan teaches aggregating information (web content) from two or more web site (col. 10, lines 44-50) on a client (i.e., network server, fig. 3, 308, col. 10, lines 44-57), see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, col. 9, lines 55-67 to col. 10, lines 1-26, col.11, lines 36-64, col. 1, lines 43-67 to col. 2, lines 1-34). Applicant especially argues that the network server of Khan is not "the client". However, specification does not clarify which system is the client, instead, only implies that processor-based system 103 can be a client (103 in fig.1, page 3, lines 22-25 in specification). The processor-based system 103 in fig. 1 is considered as the client and computer system that is also transferring

information. Transferring information is a one of server's function. Thus, examiner considers the processor-based system is as a client or a server. Khan teaches the network server (i.e., 308 in fig. 3) that is a computer system (i.e., client) that transfers information to a wireless device. Thus, the network sever of Khan can be a client or server. Hence, Khan teaches *aggregating the websites on a client* as claimed.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Isaac Woo
June 21, 2006

Conferees
Samuel Rimell, AU: 2164
Hosain Alam, SPE AU: 2166

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

INTEL CORPORATION

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER